## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS MARSHALL DIVISION

| STINGRAY IP SOLUTIONS, LLC,     | §                                  |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Plaintiff,                      | §<br>§<br>8                        |
| v.                              | § JURY TRIAL DEMANDED              |
| SIGNIFY N.V.,                   | <b>§</b><br>§                      |
| SIGNIFY (CHINA) INVESTMENT CO., | § CIVIL ACTION NOS. 2:21-CV-00043- |
| LTD.,                           | § JRG; 2:21-CV-00044-JRG           |
| SIGNIFY HONG KONG LIMITED,      | §                                  |
| SIGNIFY NETHERLANDS B.V., and   | §                                  |
| SIGNIFY POLAND SP. Z.O.O.,      | Š                                  |
|                                 | Š                                  |
| Defendants.                     | §                                  |

## PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE THAT THE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT MOOTS DEFENDANT SIGNIFY'S MOTION TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF PERSONAL JURISDICTION

Defendant Signify N.V. ("Signify") has moved to dismiss Plaintiff's infringement claims against Signify for lack of personal jurisdiction under Rule 12(b)(2). See -00250, Dkt. No. 21. On June 14, 2021, Plaintiff filed amended complaints. See e.g., -00043, Dkt. No. 15; -00044, Dkt No. 15. As a result, Signify's motion to dismiss is moot. "An amended complaint supersedes the original complaint and renders it of no legal effect unless the amended complaint specifically refers to and adopts or incorporates by reference the earlier pleading." King v. Dogan, 31 F.3d 344, 346 (5th Cir. 1994). Thus, because the original complaint has been deprived of "legal effect," Signify's Motion to Dismiss must therefore be denied as moot. See Bank of N.Y. Mellon v. Maniscalco, No. 1:15-CV-35, 2015 WL 11111369, at \*1 n.2 (E.D. Tex. May 11, 2015) (dismissing defendant's motion to dismiss original complaint as moot after plaintiff filed an amended complaint); Chaisson v. Grounds, No. 5:13-CV-54, 2014 WL 175329, at \*4 (E.D. Tex. Jan. 14, 2014) ("The Fifth Circuit

has stated that an amended complaint supersedes the original and becomes the operative pleading."); *Agency Funding, LLC v. Fillweber*, No. 3:10-cv-27, Dkt. No. 30 (W.D. Va. Oct. 18, 2010) (dismissing defendants' motions to dismiss a first amended complaint alleging improper service and lack of personal jurisdiction as moot after plaintiff filed a second amended complaint).

Dated: June 14, 2021 Respectfully submitted,

/s\_Jeffrey R. Bragalone
Jeffrey R. Bragalone (lead attorney)
Texas Bar No. 02855775
Terry A. Saad
Texas Bar No. 24066015
Marcus Benavides
Texas Bar No. 24035574
Hunter S. Palmer
Texas Bar No. 24080748

BRAGALONE OLEJKO SAAD PC

2200 Ross Avenue Suite 4600W Dallas, TX 75201 Tel: (214) 785-6670 Fax: (214) 785-6680 jbragalone@bosfirm.com tsaad@bosfirm.com

mbenavides@bosfirm.com hpalmer@bosfirm.com

Wesley Hill Texas Bar No. 24032294 **WARD, SMITH, & HILL, PLLC** P.O. Box 1231 Longview, TX 75606 Tel: (903) 757-6400

Fax: (903) 757-2323 wh@wsfirm.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF STINGRAY IP SOLUTIONS, LLC

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE THAT THE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT MOOTS DEFENDANT SIGNIFY'S MOTION TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF PERSONAL JURISDICTION was filed electronically in compliance with Local Rule CV-5(a). Therefore, this document was served on all counsel who are deemed to have consented to electronic service on June 14, 2021.

/s/ Jeffrey R. Bragalone